

NEBRASKA DDD/MLTC WAIVER WORKGROUP: QUALITY IMPROVEMENT
JULY 20, 2016

Participants: Mary Conaway; Elton Edmond; Pam Mann; Christina Mayer-Hartzell; Shannon Peterson; Darla Ramsey; Sue Spitzer; Joyful Stoves; Michelle Waller; Brad Wilson; Suzie Wysocki

Notes Recorder: Mary Conaway

Next Meeting (date/time):

Agenda: Review of CMS and Contractor comments for Aged and Disabled Waiver QIS

Topic	Person Responsible	Discussion	Action Item
Overview of CMS and Contractor QI related comments for A&D Waiver renewal	Sue	The State has responded to all questions from CMS and the CMS Contractor. The responses were resubmitted to CMS on July 19, 2016. No response had been returned by this meeting.	
Comments from both CMS and Contractor			
Sampling Approach	Sue	Both CMS and the Contractor questioned the use of a “Proportionate Random Sample” as the sampling approach for performance measures. The State is currently using this approach because of technical guidance received during renewal of the current waiver application. The State has responded to CMS that the sampling approach will be changed to a “representative sample” with a confidence interval of 95% and a +/-5% margin of error. On-site reviews and off-site reviews were previously separate data sources, but will be combined into one data source. The % of on-site and off-site file reviews will be covered in internal processes which will be reviewed annually to ensure the sample size is validated by the Raosoft calculator.	
Appendix G	Sue	The State included a performance measure for sub-assurance (b) that was written in conjunction with technical guidance for the TBI Waiver. The	

NEBRASKA DDD/MLTC WAIVER WORKGROUP: QUALITY IMPROVEMENT
JULY 20, 2016

Topic	Person Responsible	Discussion	Action Item
		performance measure addressed incident reports that were submitted for substantiated APS/CPS intakes. The wording of the measure has drawn various questions from CMS, the Contractor and others, so the State provided alternate wording in the response to CMS. The revised, proposed wording of the measure is: Number and percent of incident reports submitted by Service Coordination Agencies for substantiated Adult and Child Protective Services (APS/CPS) intakes.	
Appendix G	Sue	CMS and the Contractor had questions about the proposed measure for sub-assurance (d) regarding participants who have seen a medical provider in the last 12 months. After giving the matter further consideration, the State proposed a different measure. The proposed measure is: Number and percent of participants reviewed whose health care status was assessed at the initial review or annual assessment.	
CMS Comments			
QI Reports	Sue	CMS wanted more information about how QI reports are communicated to stakeholders. The State responded that QI reports will be provided to all members of the Quality Council, QI Subcommittee and other identified stakeholders, as well as posted on the DHHS website.	
Appendix A	Sue	CMS questioned whether there should be performance measures focused on uniformity of provider agreements throughout the State and equitable distribution of waiver openings throughout the State. The State responded that performance measures are not needed for these areas.	
Appendix C	Sue	CMS questioned the wording of the denominator in the performance measure for sub-assurance (c) which	

NEBRASKA DDD/MLTC WAIVER WORKGROUP: QUALITY IMPROVEMENT
JULY 20, 2016

Topic	Person Responsible	Discussion	Action Item
		addresses web-based training for newly hired SC and RD staff. The State responded that the denominator will be changed to “the number of newly hired SC and RD staff enrolled in web-based training”.	
Appendix I	Sue	The State had proposed a measure regarding providers documenting separate and distinct timeframes for authorized services. CMS questioned the measure as the waiver doesn’t provide that requirement. The State responded that the measure will be deleted.	
Contractor Comments			
Methods for Remediation	Sue	The Contractor wanted more detail as to how Local Level SC Agencies evaluated whether problems discovered were indicative of systemic problems. The State provided more detail as to how remediation activities are handled. The State also provided more detail as to how SC staff use the CONNECT system to run data reports and perform additional SC Agency specific file reviews.	
Use of multiple items to assess measures	Sue	In the Evidentiary Report dated 02/27/2015, CMS had indicated that some performance measures needed to be rewritten to avoid the use of the multiple items that were being used to assess the measure. The State feels the problem has more to do with the data used than the wording of the performance measure and responded that file review questions will be reworded so that multiple items will not need to be used to assess the measures.	
Appendix B	Sue	The Contractor noted that the performance measures for sub-assurance (b) could be deleted. The State responded that the performance measures will be deleted.	

NEBRASKA DDD/MLTC WAIVER WORKGROUP: QUALITY IMPROVEMENT
JULY 20, 2016

Topic	Person Responsible	Discussion	Action Item
Appendix C	Sue	The Contractor asked that a performance measure be added to measure the number of certified providers that have had an annual review. The State responded that the measure will be added.	
Appendix D	Sue	The Contractor noted that the performance measures for sub-assurance (b) and the 3 rd performance measure under sub-assurance (e) could be deleted. The State responded that the performance measures will be deleted.	
Appendix G	Sue	The Contractor requested that the phrase “including restraints and seclusion” be added to the performance measure for sub-assurance (c) regarding restrictive measures. The State responded that the phrase will be added.	
Appendix I	Sue	The Contractor requested revision of the proposed performance measures for sub-assurance (a) to measure paid claims instead of participants. The State responded that this change will be made.	
Appendix I	Sue	The Contractor requested that the performance measure for sub-assurance (b) be revised to demonstrate that the rates are changed only consistent with the approved rate methodology. The State responded the performance measure will be rewritten as requested.	